

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/500,288	ACKERMANN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul A. Zucker	1621	

All Participants:

(1) Paul A. Zucker.

(2) Corwin Umbach.
Status of Application: Allowed

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 May 2005
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:

112, 2nd paragraph of 5 and 11

Claims discussed:

5,11

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called Mr. Umbach to indicate that the application was almost in condition for allowance except that the use of the word "preferably" rendered claims 5 and 11 indefinite. The Examiner also pointed out that a section headed "Brief Description of the Drawings" was missing. Mr. Umbach agreed to authorize an Examiner's Amendment as follows in order to put the application in condition for allowance:

The claims have been amended as follows:

Claim 5, lines 3-4: The phrase [, preferably 1.05-1.15] has been deleted and replaced with the word -- and --.

Claim 11, line 3: The word [preferably] has been deleted.

New claim 18 has been added as follows:

--18. Process according to Claim 1, characterized in that the molar ratio of methyl (meth)acrylate to alcohol in the feed to the reactor is from 1.05 to 1.15.--

The specification has been amended as follows:

Page 6, line 1: The phrase [Process Description] has been deleted and replaced with the phrase -- Brief Description of the Drawings --..